

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO
1300-SW-C2

PATENT
U.S. 10/799,831

Remarks/ Arguments

In response to the Office Action mailed December 8, 2005, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections of the claims.

Claims 57 – 76 remain.

Claims 57 and 67 are being amended.

Claims 1 – 56 have been cancelled.

Claims 57 – 76 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,243,772. Applicants provide herewith a terminal disclaimer to obviate these rejections.

Claims 57 – 59, 61, 63 – 69, 71, and 73 - 76 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Hare et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,084,638) (hereinafter "the *Hare* reference"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Anticipation rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) require identity of invention. In other words, each and every feature of each and every claim rejected as anticipated must be disclosed in a single prior art reference. The *Hare* reference does not teach a system in which digital commands are transmitted across a digital wireless link for utilization at the receiving terminal to compose a presentation.

As an initial matter, Applicants again respectfully submit that the NTSC wireless link shown in Figure 1A is an analog link. Furthermore, the excerpt at Col. 15, Line 52 – Col. 16, Line 12, only vaguely calls for a "digital link"; there is otherwise no teaching in the *Hare* reference allowing one skilled in the art to make and use a wireless digital link in a multimedia system.

Finally, as is very well known in the art, an NTSC signal is an analog composite signal containing illuminance and chrominance data defining every pixel for each field being displayed on a TV screen. In such an NSTC-based system shown in the *Hare* reference, the information represented by entire fields of pixels of a presentation must

021615 500020 DALLAS 2000483.1

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO
1300-SW-C2

PATENT
U.S. 10/799,831

be composed by PC 2 and then transmitted to conventional TV 4 via transmitter 14. There is clearly no teaching in the *Hare* reference that TV 4, or any associated receiving circuitry, can accept digital commands from PC2 and accordingly compose an audio-visual presentation.

Given the substantial differences between Claims 57 – 59, 61, 63 – 69, 71, and 73 - 76, and the teachings of the *Hare* reference, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not met his burden of proving a *prima facie* case of anticipation, and therefore that the rejections of Claims 57 – 59, 61, 63 – 69, 71, and 73 - 76 should be withdrawn.

Claims 60, 62, 70, and 72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the *Hare* reference, in further view of *Smyers et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,233,637) (hereinafter "*Smyers* reference"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The differences between the *Hare* reference and the present claims have been described in detail above. These differences are not remedied by the teachings of the *Smyers* reference. In particular, similar to the *Hare* reference, the *Smyers* reference does not teach or suggest transforming digital data transmitted over a wireless link at a display appliance into a format suitable for generating a display. The *Smyers* reference only discloses a bus-based system, and furthermore, does not disclose any type of display appliance.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the rejections of Claims 60, 62, 70, and 72 as obvious in view of the *Hare* and *Smyers* references should be withdrawn.

No new matter has been added; the claims have been merely amended to more particularly claim the subject matter Applicants believe is inventive. Applicants respectfully submit that the Claims as they now stand are patentably distinct over the art cited during the prosecution thereof.

With the addition of no new claims, no additional filing fees are due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account Number 20-0821 of Thompson & Knight LLP.

021615 500020 DALLAS 2000483.1


ATTORNEY DOCKET NO
1300-SW-C2

PATENT
U.S. 10/799,831

If the Examiner has any questions or comments concerning this paper or the present application in general, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (214) 969 - 1749.

Respectfully submitted,

Thompson & Knight LLP
Attorneys for Applicant

By: 
James J. Murphy
Reg. No. 34,503

1700 Pacific Avenue
Suite 3300
Dallas TX. 75201 - 4693
Date: March 8, 2006

021615 500020 DALLAS 2000483.1